



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,861	05/10/2001	Ken Lang	KLQ-004	5134
959	7590	12/28/2005	EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP. 28 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109			HAVAN, THU THAO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	
DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/852,861	LANG, KEN
	Examiner Thu Thao Havan	Art Unit 3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-26 are pending. This action is in response to the remark received October 5, 2005.

Response to Arguments

The rejection of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Bukow (US 2002/0026338) is maintained.

Applicant's arguments filed October 5, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the arguments concerning the previously rejected claims the following comments are made:

A.) Applicant alleges that the prior art made of record fails to teach providing a first client with access to the reputation service via a communications network to furnish the information regarding a reputation of a selected party relative to the given trait. The examiner disagrees with applicant's representative since Bukow teaches providing a first client with access to the reputation service via a communications network to furnish the information regarding a reputation of a selected party relative to the given trait (para. 0030 and 0052). In other words, Bukow teaches matching is automatically performed as workers are added and/or updated in relation to reputation. In that, he discloses an evaluation form to project creators and workers. The project creator evaluation allows the employer to

evaluate the worker on various performance factors: timeliness, responsiveness, cost control, value for the money, capability, quality, and/or other factors.

B.) Applicant alleges that the prior art made of record fails to teach accepting remuneration for furnishing the portion of reputation data to the client. The examiner disagrees with applicant's representative since Bukow teaches accepting remuneration for furnishing the portion of reputation data to the client (para. 0029). In other words, Bukow allows a worker to specify how much he/she is willing to pay (i.e. remuneration) for a successful match in relation to the reputation of workers versus a project. In that, the system allows workers to pay a small fee (i.e. remuneration) for a preference in matching. Basically, Bukow discloses an Internet system matching reputation of workers and project creators or projects.

C.) Applicant alleges that the prior art made of record fails to teach providing an automated reputation service for furnishing information regarding reputations of parties relative to multiple traits. The examiner disagrees with applicant's representative since Bukow teaches providing an automated reputation service for furnishing information regarding reputations of parties relative to multiple traits (para. 0031 and 0052). In other words, Bukow teaches multiple traits according the rest of the claimed limitations when he discloses the more feedback a worker or project provider gives the more value he/she gathers when matching in the future. This, also, allows the worker to rate the project, the appropriateness of the description, the ease of working with a particular employer, and/or other factors. Thus, Bukow discloses multiple traits in relation to multiple factors.

With regards to the claims rejected as anticipated over Bukow, the examiner would like to point out that the reference teaches the claimed limitations and thus provides adequate support for the claimed limitations. Therefore, the examiner maintains that Bukow anticipated the claimed limitations.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Thao Havan whose telephone number is (571) 272-8111. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct-uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

TTH
12/22/2005

VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

